Case 4:11-cr-00146-SBA Document 29 Filed 06/25/12 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 11-0146 SBA
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Judy RAE JARVIS Defendant.	FILED
Defendant.	JUN 25 2012
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on June 25, 2012, the coefficient as a little and the Speedy Trial Act from June 25, 2012 to August 6, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial blished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 6/25/12	Kandis A. Westmore United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Deleorale (Assistant United States Attorney